



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/661,375	09/13/2000	Hannes Eberle	53470.000024	8034

29315 7590 03/04/2003

MINTZ LEVIN COHN FERRIS GLOVSKY AND POPEO PC  
12010 SUNSET HILL ROAD  
SUITE 900  
RESTON, VA 20190

[REDACTED]  
EXAMINER

SMITS, TALIVALDIS IVARS

[REDACTED]  
ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2654

DATE MAILED: 03/04/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No. <b>09/661,375</b>	Applicant(s) <b>Hannes Eberle et al.</b>	
Examiner <b>Talivaldis Ivars Smits</b>	Art Unit <b>2654</b>	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE three MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_
- 2a)  This action is **FINAL**.      2b)  This action is non-final.
- 3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
- Disposition of Claims**
- 4)  Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6)  Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8)  Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10)  The drawing(s) filed on Sep 13, 1999 is/are a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11)  The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a)  approved b)  disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13)  Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a)  All b)  Some\* c)  None of:
1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14)  Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
- a)  The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15)  Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

### Attachment(s)

- 1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6)  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Specification***

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: It fails to list related U.S. Patents and pending applications, such as U.S. Patent 6,263,051, which claim priority to provisional application 60/153,222.

Appropriate correction, by listing said Patents and Applications at the beginning of the Specification, is required.

2. The lengthy Specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the Specification.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over David Ladd *et al.* (U.S. Patent 6,269,336, filed October 2, 1998) in view of Kenneth Tsutsomu Nakatsu *et al.*

(U.S. Patent 5,787,151, issued July 28, 1998).

As per claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9-17, 19, 22-25, and, Ladd *et al.* teach establishing a communication channel, accessing a markup language document to parse the text for control of interactive voice service, or to deliver speech generated therefrom over a communication channel (col. 15, line 65 through col. 16, line 17).

Ladd *et al.* do not teach an interactive voice broadcast (*e.g.* scheduling a telephone call for a specific time to deliver the interactive voice service to a recipient), determining whether the communication channel is established with a person or device, receiving responses from the intended recipient after delivering the generated speech, and accessing additional text based on the responses. However, Nakatsu *et al.* do (col. 2, lines 38-43 and 51-62; noting that “or otherwise may reject delivery” would suggest to an artisan at the time of invention that a device would reject delivery by not responding appropriately to the generated speech prompt about the voice card message, thus terminating the communication channel; the Nakatsu *et al.* dialogue also implies that the command information comprises information about the type of input to expect from the intended recipient).

It would have been obvious for an artisan at the time of invention to add an interactive voice broadcast capability to Ladd *et al.*’s interactive voice service, because of the convenience of accomplishing Ladd *et al.*’s update information delivery goals (col. 2, lines 50-54) automatically rather than manually (*cf.* Nakatsu *et al.*’s teaching how scheduling overcomes the inconvenience of manual delivery, in col. 1, lines 42-44).

As per claim 5, Ladd *et al.* teach using a version of a TML document for their dialogue system (see the discussion of their markup language in col. 16, line 21 through col. 43, line 53)

As per claims 8, 18, and 26, neither Ladd *et al.* Nor Nakatsu *et al.* explicitly teach validating the markup language document. However, an artisan at the time of invention would have known that it is necessary to validate said document to avoid problems in the execution of the voice dialogue sequence or voice prompts and input interpretation.

As per claim 20, Ladd *et al.* suggest storing responses received from the intended recipient (e.g., in col. 27, lines 10-14).

As per claim 21, it is rejected for the same reasons as claim 11, above.

#### ***Double Patenting***

5. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

6. Claims 1, 9, 19 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 6, 8-14, 31, 33, and 36-42 of U.S. Patent No. 6,263,051. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they recite obvious interactive voice broadcast modifications of the interactive voice service limitations in the patented claims.

### ***Conclusion***

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Eric Weeren *et al.* (U.S. Patent 5,913,195, issued June 15, 1999), David L. LaRue *et al.* (U.S. Patent 5,953,406, filed May 20, 1997), Michael H. Cohen *et al.* (U.S. Patent 6,219,643, filed June 26, 1998), Wayne Arnold Hank *et al.* (U.S. Patent 6,321,198, filed February 23, 1999), and Gregory Johnson *et al.* (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0006126, filed October 2, 1998) teach various versions of voice dialogue systems.

8. **Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, D.C. 20231

**or FAXed to:**

(703) 872-9314 (please label *formal* communications  
“OFFICIAL”; please label *informal* or draft communications,  
“PROPOSED” or “DRAFT”)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 2, 2121 Crystal Drive,  
Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to the examiner, Talivaldis Ivars Smits, whose telephone number is (703) 306-3011. The examiner can normally be reached Mondays-Fridays from 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marsha D. Banks-Harold, can be reached on (703) 305-4379. The facsimile phone number for Technology Center 2600 is (703) 872-9314.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 customer service, whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.



TALIVALDIS IVARS SMITS  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment for PTO-948 (Rev. 03/01, or earlier)

6/18/01

The below text replaces the pre-printed text under the heading, "Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes," on the back of the PTO-948 (Rev. 03/01, or earlier) form.

**INFORMATION ON HOW TO EFFECT DRAWING CHANGES**

**1. Correction of Informalities -- 37 CFR 1.85**

New corrected drawings must be filed with the changes incorporated therein. Identifying indicia, if provided, should include the title of the invention, inventor's name, and application number, or docket number (if any) if an application number has not been assigned to the application. If this information is provided, it must be placed on the front of each sheet and centered within the top margin. If corrected drawings are required in a Notice of Allowability (PTO-37), the new drawings **MUST** be filed within the **THREE MONTH** shortened statutory period set for reply in the Notice of Allowability. Extensions of time may NOT be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a) or (b) for filing the corrected drawings after the mailing of a Notice of Allowability. The drawings should be filed as a separate paper with a transmittal letter addressed to the Official Draftsperson.

**2. Corrections other than Informalities Noted by Draftsperson on form PTO-948.**

All changes to the drawings, other than informalities noted by the Draftsperson, **MUST** be made in the same manner as above except that, normally, a highlighted (preferably red ink) sketch of the changes to be incorporated into the new drawings **MUST** be approved by the examiner before the application will be allowed. No changes will be permitted to be made, other than correction of informalities, unless the examiner has approved the proposed changes.

**Timing of Corrections**

Applicant is required to submit the drawing corrections within the time period set in the attached Office communication. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Failure to take corrective action within the set period will result in **ABANDONMENT** of the application.